COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

aerit of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Gold Run	Valley	6	
Inspected by:		Date	16
Officer G. W. Cassina		01/11/2010	Y

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, con	Inspections documen	n number. Under "Forw nt shall be utilized to do	rard to:" enter the nea	actices, suggestions for statewi	document ide
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection:		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included	
Follow-up Required:	Forwar	d to: Valley Division		L	
☐ Yes No	Due Da	ate: 01/15/2010			
Chapter Inspection: Grant Management Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: The Gold Run Area does not currently have its own grant. Area currently has funding from a Division wide DUI grant and an Auburn Area Speed Enforcement grant that are reported on monthly.					
ommand Suggestions for St	tatewide	e Improvement:			
None					
Inspector's Findings:					
The command level inspection reliant on Division and other A			Area should ap	pply for its own grant an	d not be

The Gold Run Area will aggressively seek grant money for the 2011 federal fiscal year focusing on the reduction of motorcycle, passenger and commercial vehicle accidents within the Area. Interstate 80 is the major traffic thoroughfare used extensively by these vehicles as the traverse the Sierra Nevada Mountain range. Truckee and Auburn Area will be included in this grant proposal. Funding will be requested for education, enforcement and materials.

Commander's Response:
Concur or
Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

CHP 680A (Rev. 02-09) OPI 010 H/DATAVADMIN/AUDITS/CHAPTERINSPECTIONS

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM TYCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command	Division.	Chapter:
Gold Run	Valley	6
Inspected by: Officer G. W. Ca	ıssina	Date: 01/11/2010

age 2 of 3		
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non eetc.)	concurrence by commander (e.g., findings re	vised, findings unchanged,
Required Action Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
Area will submit a grant proposal through o	channels to Grants Management Unit	by May 1, 2010.
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S MIGNATURE	1/18/10 DATE 1/18/10
Reviewer discussed this report with mployee	PELLEWAR'S SIGNATURE	DATE

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM TXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

ager 🤊 of 3

Command	Division:	Chapter.
Gold Run	Valley	6
Inspected by	Date	
Officer G. W.	01/11/2010	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Gold Run	Division: Valley	Number: 221
Evaluated by: Sergeant	Date: 01-11-2010	
Assisted by: Officer G. \	Date: 01-11-2010	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. TYPE OF INSPECTION Lead Inspector's Signature:						
Division Level	Command Level		Andrew Control of the		I-	
	_	5		1		
] Voluntary Self-Inspection <	Command	er's Signature	1 1	Date:	
Follow-up Required:	☐ Follow-up Inspection	50		Do	1/8/10	
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 ote: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation.						
1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?			□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?			□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not requested a grant.	
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?			□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: To date Area has not but will submit a proposal for 2010	
Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?			□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?			□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not requested a grant	
 Was GMU contacted to det personnel billing rates used preparing concept paper but 	for grant projects when	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not prepared concept papers	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

	Is supporting documentation of consent and				
	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not had any "local benefit grants"
	1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?				
	8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not had any grant project agreements.
	9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not had any contact with grant funding agencies.
	10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not had any grant expenditures.
	11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
j	12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not purchased any grant funded equipment.
	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not purchased any grant funded equipment.
	 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed 	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not applied for federal funds.
	the amount specified in the budget.				

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not applied for federal assistance.
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not applied for unanticipated federal funds.
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Valley Division handles this through the Commercial Unit.
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run has not applied for the Homeland Security grant.
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Applies to the GMU only.
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Applies to the GMU only.
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Applies to the GMU only.
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Applies to the GMU only.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM "XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

ge 1 of 3

Command: Gold Run	Division: Valley	Chapter: 6	1
Inspected by Officer G. W. Cassina		Date: 01/11/2010	

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.						
TYPE OF INSPECTION Total hours expended on the Corrective Action Plan Inclu						
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level		inspection:				
Executive Office Level		8		Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to: Valley Division				
☐ Yes	☐ Yes ☐ No Due Date: 01/15/2010			5		
Chapter Inspection: Command Overtime						
Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:						

The Gold Run Area overtime sign up practices ensure overtime is allotted in an equitable fashion. A spreadsheet is posted with the name of each officer, and a running total of their reimbursable OT *ked for the year. An officer with less reimbursable OT can bump an officer from a reimbursable OT ignment up to 48 hours before the assignment. Sergeants and officers are diligent about the accuracy of tracking method to ensure fairness of reimbursable OT allocation.

Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:

During the fourth quarter of 2009, the Gold Run Area wrapped up the Gold Run III Caltran's highway improvement project which involved a large amount of reimbursable overtime.

In 2010, the Gold Run Area anticipates another Caltran's project within the Area and, even though all departmental policy was strictly adhered to in 2009, Area feels there is always room for improvement. Several new practices will be implemented to streamline how Area assigns overtime, the sign up process, the tracking of hours, the cancellation of details, and how outside Areas will be utilized to work the details when needed.

For example, instead of using a basic/general type project log, a more in-depth detailed project log has been prepared. This detailed breakdown project log will help with checks and balances and with the tracking of every detail and/or cancellation. Further, a separate rotational sign up list will be utilized for officers outside the Gold Run Area working Gold Run details. This separate rotational sign up list will help in maintaining a fair and balanced working relationship with our sister Areas as well as ensuring a fair distribution of overtime hours. Lastly, Gold Run Area will fax all cancellation notices to outside Area Area clerks for tracking of overtime hours for checks and balances purposes for their overtime report.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM TYCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

ge 2 of 3

Command.	Division:	Chapter
Gold Run	Valley	6
Inspected by:	Date.	
Officer G. W. C	01/11/2010	

Inspector's Findings:
The command level inspection found that the Gold Run Area could streamline its practices concerning overtime book keeping as indicated under Command Suggestions in this report.
Commander's Response: ⊠ Concur or □ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM TYCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

ATE OF CALIFORNIA PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM	Command: Gold Run	Division: Vallev	Chapter.		
XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT	Inspected by: Officer G. W.	Date 01/11/2010			
ge 3, of 3				ova na	

Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE / /
the reviewer (See HPM 9.1. Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	That Gall	1/18/10
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWERS SIGNATURE	1/18/10
employee	INII A	DATE
Concur Do not concur	11 pl Myro	1/25/10
CHP 680A (Rev. 02-09) OPI 010 H/DATA/ADMIN/AUDITS/CHAPTERINSPECTIONS	/	/ /

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command: Gold Run	Division: Valley	Number: 221
Evaluated by: Sergeant D. Heavyside		Date: 01-11-2010
Assisted by: Officer G.	W. Cassina	Date: 01-11-2010

								
applica discrep Further	ble legal statues, or deficienci ancies and/or deficiencies sha more, the Exceptions Docum	items with "Yes" or "No" answer ies noted in the inspections shall all be documented on an Except ent shall include any follow-up ar " box shall be marked and only o	l be comme ions Docum nd/or correc	nted on via t ent and add tive action(s	the "Remar Iressed to t s) taken. If	ks" section. he next level this form is u	Additionally, suc	:h
			110000000					
TYPE O	FINSPECTION		Leadyinspi	ector's Signat	ure:			
	:-: ()	N. C						
│	sion Level	Command Level		_/()			
l I I Exe	cutive Office Level [Websitery Self Increation	1	سلىدكه				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Voluntary Self-Inspection	Command	er's Signature	7.		Date:	
۳٥	llow-up Required:	Follow up Inchestion	Command	er s Orginature	7. **-		Date.	
		Follow-up Inspection	5/	~ 1			1 1	
] Yes	<		-/-/	James !	2	1 118/10	
For an	plicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1. Chapter 6.				1974		
	10.71, Chapters 2, 8, and							
	er 2, and HPM 10.3, Cha							
пари	er z, and hrivi 10.5, Ch	apters 24 and 20.						
1 - 1 - 1	7 HAA 21 - 8646611 2 - 1 - 1 -			135 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -		500 No. 500 Sec. (100 Sec. 100		
		ecked, the "Remarks" section	snall be ut	ilizea for e	<u>xpianatior</u>	1.14 (#1846) (NOSA)		
1.	Is the hiring company/age		5-3			Remarks:		
	overtime being held response			☐ No	□ N/A	i (cilians,		
	minimum of four hours of			[
	uniformed employee, rega	ardless of length of						
	service/detail?							
2.	Is a minimum of four hour	rs overtime being allocated						
	to each CHP uniformed e	mployee(s) if cancellation		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	notification is made 24 ho	ours or less prior to the				1		
	scheduled detail and the	assigned CHP uniformed						
		otified of such cancellation?						
3.	Are reimbursable special							
		d with reimbursable special		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	projects?		K					
4.		ng nonuniformed personnel						
	overtime hours are not re		⊠ Yes	No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
		oursable Special Projects?	23	L				
5.	is the commander ensuring							
٥.		med for an employee, other	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	than Bargaining Unit 7, w		EN 103		LJ N/A			
	compensated time off for							
	regular work shift time?	nous worked daring their						
6.	Is "RDO" being written in	the "Notes" section of the						
V.		ord, for overtime worked on	N V00	□ No	□ NI/A	Remarks:		
	a regular day off?	ora, for overtime worked off	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A			
	Is there a CHP 90, Report	t of Court Appearance						
1.	Civil Action, completed for		NAVAA	□ Ni~		Remarks:		
			⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A			
	when overtime is associat	CU TOL CIVIL COULL!	1		1	1		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Gold Run does not have a peer support counselor assigned to the Area.
	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16.	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: